Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

107

08-443 SEP 3-2008

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
William K. Suter, Clerk

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Case----------

WILLIAM SMITH (PRO SE)

Petitioner

V.

ALVIN FRIEDMAN, ET AL SUBSTITUTE

TRUSTEE

Respondent

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to The DIRECT COURT OF APPEALS MARYLAND CONSTITUTIONAL APPEAL ON EXPRESS WAIVER CASE DATE.8-13, -07. No.-07-11

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(Pro se) Petitioner William Smith 1001 Saddle Hill Rd. Deland Fl. 32720 Ph# 386-734-0476

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

*** (1) Trial Court Manifest Plain Constitutional Due Process Err to Amend #5 Guaranteed Protection Rights against this Injustice.** ***Was Not Constitutional Correct.---*** **Depriving petitioner of Plain justice, and protection, pervasion to, (Home), good life, liberty, and property. (a) Fair hearing. (b) fair trial. (c) Fair Timely Notice right of innocent, to be proven guilty, by the evidence, by trial by jury.-** ***Facts 1 thru 12 remedy is NOT impossible by certiorari TO honor guarantee justice To Reckless substantial, unjustifiable, intent to abuse the mortgage deed of trust contract, without any legal timely notice, summons, service resting on an illegal default less debt not verified. No case to the legal process as a matter of law.!?***

(2) Trial court Manifest plain Constitutional Due Process and Equal Protection Err to Amend #14 Guaranteed Protection Rights to be enforced, against the respondent bad faith intent.--** ***(a) Lack of Notice, jurisdiction (extrinsic fraud) to all court authority. (b) Lack of Verified Default Debt, no legal case. (c) Requesting illegal (Ex parte) summary judgment, without any Notice, Summons, Service to this (pro se) petitioner. Is Reckless substantial, unjustifiable abuse of the legal integrity of Constitutional Rights

(3) Court must let justice be done, though the heavens may fall. Defective summary judgment is not a substitution, for trial by jury.** ***Resting on creative form, technicality, to over rule substantive evidence of law. Where the respondent could not meet its burden of proof. When truth of fact, on good best evidence should never embarrass any court, law, justice speaking with one voice. Causing certiorari to be plain necessary.

LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] All parties do not appeal in the caption of the case on the cover page. Alist of all parties to the proceeding in the court who's judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows.

Agent #1 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Respondent substitute trustee Supreme Court bar Kenneth J. Mac Fadyen, P.A. Totman Building Suite 400, 210 E. Redwood Street Baltimore MD. 21202–PH# (410)-685-1763

Agent #2 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Constitutional Direct appeal to Respondent Alvin Friedman, Substitute trustee-- Express Waiver Admission Defense 8-13-07 Case # (07-11). Lack jurisdictional authority, respondents Attorney John R. Fischel Miles & Stockbridge, P.D. #10 Light street Baltimore MD.21202– PH# (410)-727-6464

OPINIONS BELOW

From this unreported opinion of the Maryland, Court of Special Appeal order # 906 September term. 2005,Maryland Rule 8-114. Second Court , manifest Constitutional plain err UNREPORTED OPINION- 15- September 05. On. Supreme Court Express Waiver of admission defense denied 8-13-07 07-11, ON. (APPENDIX -A) --THRU- (APPENDIX A-4)

Trial Court original Manifest constitutional plain err. TO this direct appeal of constitutional due process Amend #5. And Due process and equal protection strict scrutiny, prejudice by differential treatment, all court's lack legal jurisdictional authority to this end. Amend #14. To Maryland court of appeal's, COURT of last resort for constitutional justice TO (APPENDIX-B)

JURISDICTION

[B] For cases from Maryland state court of appeals last resort, Direct Constitutional Question denied by Appeal, TO Maryland Court of Appeals

[B] A timely petition for rehearing/Reconsideration was therefore denied on the following date June 13, 2008 and a copy of the order denying reconsideration appears as (APPENDIX B)
The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATUTORY PROVOKED INVOLVED

MARYLAND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEED AUTHORITY

Maryland Circuit Court Manifest constitutional plain err. Punishment without due process of law. Equal Protection of law of the land direct authority.

(a) Article #1 Court can not take away Guaranteed Rights.
(b) Article #3 Appellate Court jurisdictional authority
(c) Article #4 State Court Constitutional duties.
(d) Article #6 Supreme Court Due Process/ Law of the Land Equal Protection.
(e) Article #23 Trial by jury/Civil Proceedings.
(f) Article #24 Due Process
(g) Maryland Circuit Court of Appeals authority, used the supreme court as direct authority, over errs of due process and equal protection, as per Amendment #14 , U.S. Constitutional law judgment

FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS GUARANTEED AUTHORITY

Amend #4- Maryland Courts Manifest Constitutional Plain Err.-- Deprived of legal rights. Due Process to bar violation of unreasonable search and seizures resting on default less, unverified debt. Of fraud foreclosure breach of contract, as per Mortgage deed of trust. To verify legal default debt as promised.

Lack of legal due process. To court legal jurisdictional authority, Notice, Summons, Service, over case as a matter of law . Led to Illegal fraud (ex parte) hearing, WHICH led to Illegal, Defective illegal (Ex parte) summary Judgment, to the end not legal as a matter of law.!?

Amend#5- Maryland Court Manifest Constitutional Plain Err. -Deprived of legal due process of fair notice, summons, service. Fair hearing. Fair trial by jury. To make petitioner, pay twice for a crime the courts now know the petitioner did not commit. Depriving petitioner of due process, rights good Life, Liberty, and Property in question, without Due Process of Law.

Amend #14 Maryland Courts Manifest Constitutional plain err.- Deprived petitioner of good life, Liberty and Property without Due Process and Equal Protection of the strict scrutiny, differential treatment Jurisdiction of Maryland and Federal Law Authority as Guaranteed by Law, by allowing Technicalities to over rule Justice TO Side Step Constitutional law.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The innocent petitioner, under oath, told the courts , the truth. This err, is plain reversible err. Petitioner is exercising its legal constitutional guaranteed rights to defend, against this evil crime. With clear meritorious defense, of due process to respondent crime and trial court, appellate court (manifest plain constitutional err), of compelling state and federal constitutional law evidence, against Bank of America original bad faith, (intrinsic fraud) foreclosure, breach of contract, lack of a legal default debt case 1996- 97.!? As required, by contract. *Crime clearly Cross the LINE* on fabricated contract legal duty" evidence Rule *1-341*NOTE-Petitioner did not default contract.*!"Bank Court had no constitutional right to take my home.

Bank of America did file #1 and 2 express waivers of admission defense (plea) for their crime. *Requesting leniency, and mercy from the courts, for this evil deed .In emotional err, the court judgments to date, make the *innocent petitioner guilty of a crime, the petitioner did not commit*. And make the guilty bank innocent, of the crime committed to, and go free to evade the law .

(A) Banks original Agent Friedman's bad faith evil (Extrinsic Fraud) crime of compelling lack of legal jurisdiction, to any court filed Aug-20th 97 injustice., THAT clearly cross the line of integrity to this illegal process, fabricating evidence , *is fraud on the court*, For lack of legal (ex parte) hearing, without notice to the (pro se) petitioner, to defend, and *present all this indisputable, strong damaging compelling evidence, to all courts err on this federal constitutional due process, and equal protection conflict end, is unconstitutional.*

The circuit trial court of Maryland plain, harmful

constitutional due process and equal protection manifest Err , Is without legal , timely jurisdictional evidence , has (NO CASE). Over this illegal FRAUD foreclosure, breach of contract, (NO CASE) as a matter of law.!? Can't by err, be enforce Against this innocent petitioner rights to his property, as per amend #5 and Amend. 14 compelling Constitutional due process and equal protection rights.!? Rule 8-131

(Respondent Express Waiver, corroborates this truth. Rule 2-322 And *Can not, be used to Entrap or Bar Constitutional Guaranteed Due Process Justice),to triumph and trump constitutional guaranteed law!?

POINT OF LAW. A party legally within the jurisdictional authority of a competent court, can file its legal claim before said court. A party within the jurisdiction of the law of the land, *rights are instantly protected, by the authority of the law*, and up held by all the courts for compelling equal justice to Amend #5 and 14 protecting petitioners rights to this property in question .!? *Petitioner have legal rights to property. Court Had right to honor law, and tell truth.*

***Respondent, court, has no right or claim to property.!*POINT OF LAW- Parties within the jurisdictional authority, of the law of the land. *Is required to know and obey the law.* *Party that obey the law, is an innocent party in the eye of the law of reason. *And must be protected by the highest level of law.*!* Party that disobey the law, *and is found to be a guilty party*, and must face the legal punishment under the protection of law, must not go free of IT'S JUSTICE *This case has been through the legal process to this court *before, 4-12-02,- 01-1391 Again 8-13-07,-07-11 and Again, DENIED,* Coming to rest**

on the respondents, own free will Express Waiver of Admission Rule 2-322 Defense of a Guilty (Plea).!?

***The circuit court rules , principle of constitutional law, speak to plain legal jurisdictional authority for *others, but fail in its duty to preserve the law for this (pro se) petitioners RIGHTS why* To plain legal timely verification of default debt to contract. To legal prima facie case, NOT this fraud, requires legal plain due process of law to be legally enforceable by the courts equal protection of law, to this petitioners legal rights**

The constitutional guaranteed rights of the peoples protection, in this case must know no mother or farther. *To let justice be done though the heavens should fall. This evil deed crime, is not impossible for one voice court justice, STANDARD requirements, on clear plain manifest circuit court constitutional err. *Bank and agent Friedman did not deny they never, ever had a legal case, and cross the line to this fraud end.!?

Respondent attorney Friedman, with unclean hands, and privy, first hand knowledge, of the banks fraud foreclosure ,*never denied the bank had instructed,* its attorney, ***to not verify the fraud foreclosure default debt,*** as pursuant to the terms of the contract, mortgage deed of trust. As promised by attorney Mac fadyen **July 11th 97** notice letter **DUTY** , signed by attorney **Kenneth J. Macfadyen!?*NOTE- *Attorney Macfadyen stated clearly, to the trial court, in open court 9-11-99 hearing, that the bank would not let the attorney verify the default debt to this end.! Respondent admit liability***

In the name of constitutional justice this case is over

*The petitioner filed its **Aug-5th 97** signed dispute of this fraud foreclosure, default debt to be verified as required by law. ***DUTY- The bank would not, could not,***

verified this fraud fabricated default debt.!? They had no legal case as a matter of law for any court to enforce FACT Court err illegally took home on admitted fraud

******Respondent fraud unconstitutional*** .Did sham the court on fabrication **August 20th 97,** filing this illegal **NO case to** docket, as a proper, standard requirements (legal foreclosure) to make petitioner, and family **pay over and over**, long after petitioner is dead for its crime.

(Extrinsic Fraud FACT #1)** Respondent had full detail privy, knowledge to the banks (intrinsic fraud) accountability, Liability for this damages.—**(FACT #2)** ***Respondent knew, bank could not verify fraud default debt. And no competent court could enforce Plain fraud against petitioner rights.—**(FACT #3)**.***Respondent had right*** to defend BANK'S crimes against the contract duty principle of Plain law.--- **(FACT #4)** ***Respondent had absolutely no right*** to fabricate the Maryland Circuit Court Civil- non-domestic case information sheet to case CAE 97-16794 to set- up the court for this emotional err.

(FACT #5) With out this safeguard (protection sheet, of plain innocent petitioner rights of law, due process. Respondent could not file its no case illegal intent to scam court TO DOCKET.? To evade constitutional law Rights Trial, Jury, be heard, seizure.!

(FACT #6) ***Respondent knew, no timely, notice, summons,. Service, by certified mail restricted delivery*** , was sent to the (pro se) petitioner to dispute this illegal known action to scam court.–**(FACT #7)** ***Respondent know, but requested an illegal rush to plain (ex parte) summary judgment injustice***, with out notice to the (pro se) petitioner, to ***Contaminate, Intimidate, Manipulate,*** scam to embarrassed court ***retaliation injustice*** to this

end.-(**FACT #8**) ***Respondent would plain deny intent and dispute*** in the circuit trial court, court of special appeals, to its bad faith crime. And the court with extreme unfair prejudice ***manifest constitutional error*** to preponderance of **plain** evidence in the records before the court and the clear and convincing evidence, would ***deny petitioner plain due process, rights to laws.***

(**FACT #9**) Trial circuit court erred on due process, Amend #4 ,# 5& 14, due process and equal protection scrutiny, discriminating is plain differential treatment to principles of law, plain federal constitution guaranteed protection rights, of this (pro se) petitioner right to life, liberty, property. ***As required by law***.—(**FACT #10**) The Court of special appeals chose by plain unreported opinion, **side step constitutional bill of rights**, and bar lower court from Revisory power. ***Should not affect this high court justice***. (**FACT #11**) The Maryland court of appeals,. **last resort , plain side step** and would not hear embarrassment err, ***is retaliation against rights***, of innocent petitioners plain constitutional standard Rights

(**FACT #12**) **Statement of the case , and** Facts 1 thru 12 is clear, plain manifest constitutional err,. It is clear, fair and plain ***NECESSARY*** for supreme court to grant certiorari and **finalize this fraud on fraud**, which rest on ***fraud intent of no jurisdictional authority***, in err, use respondent express waiver of admission, guilty (plea) defense, illegally to BAR plain constitutional , due process and equal protection of people, petitioners, rights to (home) justice to recover over $ 500,000.00 damages and counting. **And Not let respondent crime, go free.***

Petitioner Pray For Constitutional Justice Protection.

Respectfully  **Submitted**

(Pro se) petitioner William Smith- 1001 Saddle hill rd Deland Fl.32720- Ph#386-734-0476.

AFFIDAVIT

I William Smith (pro se) petitioner, certified under the penalty of perjury forgoing petition for writ of certiorari request and the facts and evidence herein in true and correct.

EXECUTED.....Sept. 3, 07.....

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

I William Smith (pro se) petitioner certify in good faith, three copies of this requested for writ of ceritorari petition, was sent - day of September 07 to respondents Attorney of record- John R. Fischel of Miles and Stockbridge P.C. #10 Light Street Baltimore Maryland 21-202. PH# (410)-727-6464

In good faith RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

(Pro se) Petitioner

Facsimile/Signature/Exact Copy
Unreported. In the court of special appeals of Maryland
No. 906 Sep Term, 2005
William Smith V. Alvin Friedman ET.AL. Substitute Trustees
Murphy, C.J.,-Getty, James S. (Ret, Specially assigned), Rodowsky, Lawrence F.-(Ret, Specially assigned),-- JJ.—Opinion by Getty, J.—filed: April 28th, 2006—CAE:-97-16794

Compounding the absent of an Appealable issues is appellant's in ability to st This matter originated with a foreclosure sail filed in 1997 by the Substitute trustees in their capacity as foreclosure counsel to Bank of America. The property, being foreclosed for default in payments on a promissory note, was the residence of William Smith, appellant, who resided in prince George's county.

The contretemps of this foreclosure action are that, after four appeals, all denied adversely to appellant, neither the Supreme Court of the United States, the court of appeals, the Court of special appeals, nor the Circuit Court of prince Georges County can dissuade appellant from continuing this futile efforts to resuscitate his claims of fraud, mistake or irregularity in the foreclosure proceeding.

ate clearly and concisely his response to the ruling he has appealed into prior unreported proceedings before this court, similar problems arose. In William Smith V. Bank America Mortgage, FSB, No.1832,September Term 1999, this court stated: "Smith has appealed to

this court from the child's court's decision. His arguments on appeal or for the most part, unintelligible."

In William Smith V. Bank of America F.S.B., No.1351 Sep term ,2002 commenting on appellant's "Unfortunate" decision to represent his self, this court stated: "ignorance of procedure can prove Lethal to this case for a novice such as Smith in Smith's case, it has foreclosed his opportunity to attempt to prove that the sale was the result of fraud.! Unfortunately, Appellant has not excepted the court's advice.

It is of no consequence, how ever, that the appellant is representing himself because we require that all parties comply with the rule appellate procedure

The procedural evidentiary and appellate rules apply alike to parties and their attorney's. No different standards apply when parties appeals pro se.—Tretick V.Layman, 95 Md. App.62,86 (1993).

THIS CASE

A Foreclosure action was filed by the substitute trustees end 1997, and a foreclosure sale was conducted on July-27-1998 the bank purchased the property for $110,835.00. the sale was ratified of Nov-9-1998 and no exceptions was filed.

The matter was referred to a court auditor, who reported on April 15-1999 that the Nets proceeds for the sale resulted in a deficiency of $1,158.34. appellate filed and exceptions to the auditor's report and, prior to a hearing on its exceptions, on July-21-1999, he filed suite against the bank, alleging that Bank Employees fraudulently altered his check.He did no

seek to void the foreclosure, but he request damages in the amount of $1,500,00.

Appellant's Exceptions to the auditors was over ruled by the circuit court in Sept.99 following the affirmance of the auditor's report, appellant filed his first appeal to this court, not with standing that the foreclosure was then and enrolled judgment. He alleged in his appeal that the foreclosure sale was contained by fraud, deception, and irregularity. This court held that the appellant failed to present any creditable evidence to a trial court of fraud, mistake or irregularity, as contemplated by the rule 21-535 that would warrant vacating the enrolled judgment ratifying the foreclosure sale of appellant's house.

Undaunted by this court's denial of his motion to revise the judgment of the trial court, appellant filed a petition for writ of certiorari, which the court of appeals denied on or about June 25th, 2001 appellate filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In addition to this actions filed against the substitute trustee appellant filed and action against Bank America and Attempted to raise the same issue that was raise in the foreclosure case against the same party. The complaint was dismissed by the trial court with prejudice in Aug.25th -2002. On Aug 19th-2002 another appeal was filed. William Smith V. Bank America Mortgage F.S.B. No.1351, Sep term 2002. In an unreported filed June 24-2003 this court affirm the judgment in favor of the bank, based upon the doctrine of Res Judicata.

(APPENDIX A-2),

Again, appellant sought review by the court of Appeals and by the Supreme Court, both petitions were denied. In September-2004 and on January 3rd 2005, April 13th 2005, and May 25th 2005 appellate motion alleging "illegal jurisdiction" which resulted in the trial court (platt, J.) Stating the appellant's motion was with out merit and has previously been denied by the court on May 16th 2005. Thus, appellant ignored May 16th denial of his motion by Judge Platt and refiled the same motion nine days later.

Appellant's most recent appeal, date, June 27th 2005, we presume is in response to Judge Platt denial of the appellant motion questioning the court's jurisdiction, We note that, in appellants motion filed in the Supreme Court against the substitutes trustees and against Bank America, the respondents in each case filed a notice with the court stating that "I do not intend to file a response to this petition for a writ of certiorari unless one is requested by the court." Despite the fact that both petitions were denied, appellant construes the respondent's electing not to file a reply as an admission of guilt in the allegedly unlawful foreclosure proceedings.

For the final time, we instruct appellate that the foreclosure proceeding had been upheld by ever court from the Circuit Court of Prince George's County through the Supreme of the United States. Any attempt by appellant to continue filed frivolous motions or appellants relating to foreclosure proceed will not warrant a response beyond denied "denied"

(APPENDIX A-3),

Further consideration for this case will be a waste of judicial resources and any added expensive to the appellant neither is justifiable.

Appeal Dismissal; Costs Will be Paid by appellant

Appendix #19 appear from this dates events after

Facsimile/Signature /Exact Copy

In The Court of Appeals Of Maryland . Petition Docket. No. 504 September Term, 2007 (No. 906, Sept. Term, 2005, Court Of Special Appeals)

William Smith V. Aivin Friedman, et al. Substitute Trustee

ORDER

-The Court having considered the motion for reconsideration filed in the above entitled case, it is.

ORDERED, by the court of appeals of Maryland, that the motion for reconsideration be, and it is hereby, denied.-

/s/ Robert M. Bell -Chief Judge

DATE: June 13, 2008-

Judge Murphy did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

(APPENDIX- B)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 23 2008
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

115

(2)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Case No. 08-443

WILLIAM SMITH (PRO SE)

Petitioner

V.

ALVIN FRIEDMAN, ET AL SUBSTITUTE

TRUSTEE

Respondent

On Petition for writ of Certiorari to The DIRECT COURT OF APPEALS MARYLAND CONSTITUTIONAL APPEAL EXPRESS WAIVER CASE DATE.8-13, -07. No.-07-11

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REHEARING

(Pro se) Petitioner William Smith
1001 Saddle Hill Rd. Deland Fl. 32720
Ph# 386-734-0476

GROUNDS OF TRUTH IN GOOD FAITH

Lack jurisdictional authority,,

LEGAL ARGUMENTS

All litigants in this civil matter are as much entitled to legal due process of law standards as any parties prosecutions the constitutional guarantees apply alike to rights of life, liberty and property by courts

(1) Extraordinary writ exercising unusual power on incitive power to remedy this intentional malicious fraud on fraud, that touches due process Amendment #5 and due process and equal protection Amendment #14 to all constitutional guaranteed law rights to be preserved.

(a) The bank of America filed and express waiver of admission defenses to fraud foreclosure, to the mortgage breach of contract with knowledge, motive, intent of fraud.. Acknowledges my legal mortgage is in good and valid of the full amount of the note. And the mortgager has no defense to this act against the mortgage to this end.

(b) The respondent, the Bank America Agent, with privy knowledge, file of its own free will its express waiver of admission defenses to (extrinsic fraud) which is jurisdictional, to side step (evade) constitutional due process and equal protection to cover up the crime and walk away free, the waiver is to voluntary relinquishment or abandonment all legal rights with knowledge, motive, intent, Mercy "The term waiver is one of those indefinite connotation in which our legal literature abounds, like a cloak, it covers a multitude of sins." William

R. Anson , Principles of the law of contracts 419(Arthur L. Corbined., 3d Am. ed 1919)

(A) The people must have strict scrutiny in the use of its constitutional guaranteed protection, from and by the courts as a matter of law safeguard of justice - ***Kill the means and you kill the case.!?*** elements of due process of law, and the law of the law is constitutional guaranteed to all as they relates to a judicial proceedings are notice, summons, service and fair, timely opportunity to defend.

(B) The innocent petitioner is a majority of one, against this extraordinary crime injustice to all law.

(C) Fair trial, Fair trial by jury, standards on request in a fair tribunal, is a basic requirement of due process, any presumption must favor the legal constitutionality, reasonable doubt favor sustain it.

(D) The right to be tried in accordance with the law is the constitutional privilege of every party.

(1) Standard jurisdictional requirement of all legal cases is mandatory before any and all courts Authority can be legally use to attach this action.

(2) Respondent, with knowledge, motive, intent of fraud on the court requested, and received an (ex parte), defective summary judgment to this end.

(3) The fourteenth amendment of the peoples constitution deny the governmental right to take my property without due process and equal rights protection strict scrutiny to this differential discriminating treatment as a standard matter of law

(4)Rule 2-535 revisory power (b) fraud, mistake, irregularity, on motion by any party can be filed at any time for Maryland court of a appeals.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

*** (1) Trial Court Manifest Plain Constitutional Due Process Err to Amend #5 Guaranteed Protection Rights against this Injustice. *Was Not Constitutional Correct.*--- Depriving petitioner of extraordinary Plain justice, and protection, pervasion to, (Home), good life, liberty, and property. (a) Fair hearing. (b) fair trial. (c) Fair Timely Notice right of innocent, to be proven guilty, by the evidence, by trial by jury.– *remedy is NOT impossible by certiorari TO honor guarantee justice To Reckless substantial, unjustifiable, intent to abuse the mortgage deed of trust contract, without any legal timely notice, summons, service resting on an illegal default less debt not verified. No case to the legal process as a matter of law.!?***

(2) Trial court Manifest plain Constitutional Due Process and Equal Protection extraordinary Err to Amend #14 Guaranteed Protection Rights to be enforced, against the respondent bad faith intent.-- *(a) Lack of Notice, jurisdiction (extrinsic fraud) to all court authority. (b) Lack of Verified Default Debt, no legal case. (c) Requesting illegal (Ex parte) summary judgment, without any Notice, Summons, Service to this (pro se) petitioner. Is Reckless substantial, unjustifiable abuse of the legal integrity of Constitutional Rights

(3) Court err demands any process initiated by Supreme Court let justice done though the heavens should fall. Defective summary judgment is not a substitution for trial by jury. Resting on respondent express waiver of admission defense, to extraordinary manifest constitutional err intended to side step justice causing certiorari to be plain necessary. *Kill the means and you kill the case.!?

LIST OF PARTIES

[ ] All parties do not appeal in the caption of the case on the cover page. Alist of all parties to the proceeding in the court who's judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows. its express waiver of admission defense (plea) 10-22-08/ 08-443/

Agent #1 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Respondent substitute trustee Supreme Court bar Kenneth J. Mac Fadyen, P.A. Totman Building Suite 400, 210 E. Redwood Street Baltimore MD. 21202–PH# (410)-685-1763

Agent #2 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Constitutional Direct appeal to Respondent Alvin Friedman, Substitute trustee-- Express Waiver Admission Defense 8-13-07 Case # (07-11). Lack jurisdictional authority, respondents Attorney John R. Fischel Miles & Stockbridge, P.D. #10 Light street Baltimore MD.21202– PH# (410)-727-6464

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GROUNDS 1I1 & 1I1A page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED 2I2
LIST OF PARTIES 3I3
APPENDIX EXIBIT 1 COURT ORDER
APPENDIX EXIBIT 2 WAIVER

JURISDICTION

EXIBIT 1 COURT ORDER

RULES

FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS
AMENDMENT 1 1
AMENDMENT IV 1
AMENDMENT V 1
AMENDMENT VII 1
AMENDMENT VIII 1
AMENDMENT IX 2
AMENDMENT XIV 2

SUPREME COURT RULES

RULE 44 1-9
MARYLAND RULE 2-535 1-5

CASE LAW

CASE LAW AUTHORITY I I, I-A

"The term waiver is one of these indefinite connotation in which our legal literature abounds, like a cloke, it covers a multitude of sins." William R. Anson, principles of the law of contracts 419(Arthur L. Corbined., 3d Am. ed 1919).

OPINIONS BELOW

From this unreported opinion of the Maryland, Court of Special Appeal order # 906 September term. 2005,Maryland Rule 8-114. Second Court , manifest Constitutional plain err UNREPORTED OPINION-15- September 05. On. Supreme Court Express Waiver of admission defense denied 8-13-07 07-11, ON. (APPENDIX -A) --THRU- (APPENDIX A-4)

Trial Court original Manifest constitutional plain err. TO this direct appeal of constitutional due process Amend #5. And Due process and equal protection strict scrutiny, prejudice by differential treatment, all court's lack legal jurisdictional authority to this end. Amend #14. To Maryland court of appeal's, COURT of last resort for constitutional justice TO (APPENDIX-B)

JURISDICTION

[B] For cases from Maryland state court of appeals last resort, Direct Constitutional Question denied by Appeal, TO Maryland Court of Appeals

[B] A timely petition for rehearing/Reconsideration was therefore denied on the following date June 13, 2008 and a copy of the order denying reconsideration appears as (APPENDIX B)

The jurisdiction of this court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATUTORY PROVOKED INVOLVED

MARYLAND STATE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEED AUTHORITY

Maryland Circuit Court Manifest constitutional plain err. Punishment without due process of law. Equal Protection of law of the land direct authority.

(a) Article #1 Court can not take away Guaranteed Rights.
(b) Article #3 Appellate Court jurisdictional authority
(c) Article #4 State Court Constitutional duties.
(d) Article #6 Supreme Court Due Process/ Law of the Land Equal Protection.
(e) Article #23 Trial by jury/Civil Proceedings.
(f) Article #24 Due Process
(g) Maryland Circuit Court of Appeals authority, used the supreme court as direct authority, over errs of due process and equal protection, as per Amendment #14 , U.S. Constitutional law judgment

FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS GUARANTEED AUTHORITY

Amend #4- Maryland Courts Manifest Constitutional Plain Err.-- Deprived of legal rights. Due Process to bar violation of unreasonable search and seizures resting on default less, unverified debt. Of fraud foreclosure breach of contract, as per Mortgage deed of trust. To verify legal default debt as promised.

Lack of legal due process. To court legal jurisdictional authority, Notice, Summons, Service, over case as a matter of law . Led to Illegal fraud (ex parte) hearing, WHICH led to Illegal, Defective illegal (Ex parte) summary Judgment, to the end not legal as a matter of law.!?

Amend#5– Maryland Court Manifest Constitutional Plain Err. -Deprived of legal due process of fair notice, summons, service. Fair hearing. Fair trial by jury. To make petitioner, pay twice for a crime the courts now know the petitioner did not commit. Depriving petitioner of due process, rights good Life, Liberty, and Property in question, without Due Process of Law.

Amend #14 Maryland Courts Manifest Constitutional plain err.- Deprived petitioner of good life, Liberty and Property without Due Process and Equal Protection of the strict scrutiny, differential treatment Jurisdiction of Maryland and Federal Law Authority as Guaranteed by Law, by allowing Technicalities to over rule Justice TO Side Step Constitutional law.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The known innocent petitioner, under oath plead for supreme court equal justice under the safe guards of constitutional due process and equal protection rights against the circuit court plain manifest unconstitutional harmful reversible err. For Review.

Amendment #5 due process , Amendment #14 due process and equal protection to this differential treatment of the petitioners rights guaranteed by law, justice to be made whole As required by law .

Again make the courts aware of the truth of law, facts, state and federal to this crime, being abused by the Maryland Circuit trial Court, Court of Appeals and the Respondent Extrinsic fraud as a matter of law in conflict to the process. Using fiction of law, "***the court is using the age old adit , that if the (pro se) petitioner, do not know its rights, the petitioner, has no rights***" to this end.

And the courts and respondent can and will use this fiction to bar constitutional due process to this extraordinary fraud on fraud, case to constitutional manifest err, against.*-(a)- Amendment# 1 freedom of speech, redress rights.*-(b)- Amendment # IV The RIGHT against illegal searched and seized.-*-(c)- Amendment #V The right against being illegally deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.*- (d)- Amendment #VII The right of trial by impartial jury in and impartial court.*- (e)- Amendment #VIII, To be punish for over 12 years while being known innocent, of the guilty respondents evil crime. As a

matter of law corroborated by the respondents admission defense, and the respondent never in the U.S. Supreme Court case denying any of the petitioners truth and evidence is cruel and unusual punishment to avoid the damage of over $ 500,000.00 to date and counting, and the court let the respondent go free, is more extraordinary extreme cruel and unusual punishment inflicted on this petitioner, an the American people dream. With no protection.!? AUTHORITY FOR JUSTICE"

*- (f)- Amendment # IX The respondent exercising its rights to legally file its express waiver of admission, defense plea, which is by law, and admission defense. NOTE- Is the same right the petitioner possess, and the court can never construed this right to deny the (pro se) petitioner constitutional guaranteed rights retained by the people due process. Constitutional guarantee.

POINT OF LAW- The Supreme Court case law, show clearly some states have enforce their law of express waiver on an admission defense, when file by a party to the case, to which the state has legal jurisdiction in that case.. ***Last resort justice***.

POINT OF LAW- The supreme court is also on record, stating the court will respect the rights of the state to enforce the law, to justice under its law.

*-(g)-Amendment # XIV The state of Maryland deprived this (pro se) petitioner of its demanded legal compelling jurisdictional rights, the court must have, to address all rights there after to the authority to all manifested guaranteed constitutional

due process rights of law, and facts, all due process and equal protection rights against this extensive vast court err. Discriminating treatment against strict scrutiny, is far reaching illegal and unconstitutional. Making supreme court certiorari extremely NECESSARY to remedy this evil crime.

To bar the trial court and respondent evading,, and Side Stepping , guaranteed constitutional due process and equal protection, as guaranteed law to Safeguard this (Pro Se) petitioner, protected rights . And not replace it with a lack of legal jurisdictional standard requirement authority to this case coming to rest on this known defective manifest illegal summary judgment err, to this constitutional guaranteed due process end, with no place to rest.!? **Court Harmful reversible err**

Expanding fraud on fraud, to not let justice be done though the heavens should fall. By USING the respondent own admission to the crime, from on and about 12 years from September 96 to date is unconstitutional to this extraordinary destruction of court, constitutional guaranteed justice, law of the land, speaking with one voice. ***To rest this case.!?*** (This injustice price is too high).!?

Being entrapped, and barred by the respondent, own free will legal , express waiver of admission defense (plea), to this extreme unfair prejudice manifest constitutional err, that clearly contaminate, intimidate, retaliate and manipulate due process and equal protection, to the American people safeguards against this fraud foreclosure, injustice that clearly

impact the peoples, trust in the law. merits of extraordinary unfair, illegal, defective, extensive intentional foreclosure. Infliction great emotional distress on the peoples law process. From this severe, outrageous, reckless attack on the courts integrity and constitutional guaranteed justice of law to date's end.!? ***Make this an extreme unfair emotional extraordinary act of intentional manifested injustice***. To constitutional law.!?

"The respondent evil crime actions clearly, illegally, immorally crossed the line. And made it extremely necessary for the supreme court to issue certiorari and on the courts own incitive review this compelling, extraordinary reversible case."

Sending a strong, clear, convincing message to the people that its constitutional protection is safe, and in good hands, in good working order, will stand the test of time from those parties evil minds. who wish to break the law and destroy due process and equal protection, and use an express waiver, to emotionally entrap the court ability, to preserve the constitutional guaranteed standard of justice to the law of the land preserved authority. As a matter of law . **"No action before the court is impossible to remedy, no one is above the law." JUSTICE**

**** To instantly protect ALL. And the innocent, poor, the few, and less knowledgeable of the legal process, from the abuse and greed of some who will cross the line to this end. From the rich and powerful, who may wish to explore the system in which the court must, will take no part. (The court***

COURT CAN NOT BE THE ADVERSARY

can never be a party to an action, in which the court sits in judgment, an evade constitutional guaranteed law, remedy to the American people rights, and trump constitutional guaranteed law!?

POINT OF LAW- A few years back, a young boy, from Cuba, washed on our shore, an instantly as a matter of law, was in the legal jurisdictional authority of the law of the land, guarantee justice protection as preserved, state and federal law .!?

FACT- The boy did not know our laws, but he was still protected by guaranteed law justice.

FACT- The boy was the authority of one person, legally within his guaranteed rights against the many, injustice. (The law is still the law), The high court reviewed the process an up held the law against all possible extraordinary merits raised by the rich and powerful, The court and constitutional voice on law, JUSTICE, spoke with one voice, the boy was sent back to follow his dream as a matter of law. **POINT OF LAW.**

The petitioner request the same protection as the boy from Cuba. under constitutional guaranteed jurisdictional law. Against the admitted guilty respondents, action ***GOING FREE OF THIS CRIME.*** There by making the innocent (pro se) petitioner guilty of a crime the court know the petitioner did not commit, but family will pay for the rest of our life, for a crime, we did not commit. **THIS PRICE IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY TOO HIGH, PUT THE PUBLIC LIBERTIES AT RISK**

NO ONE SHOULD EVER BE MADE TO PAY FOR THE OTHER PARTIES ADMITTED CRIME

We will lose everything we have worked so hard for, SOMETIMES two jobs and honored the law. My wife and Three kids are in very good standing with the law. NOTE- I have been investigated back to the day I was born , by the very best agents of this great nation. I have a legal top level security clearance that touch's the top level of this nation. I have found to be trust worthy. (What crime did I commit), The court is well aware I have committed no crime ***PUNISH INNOCENT, GUILTY GO FREE***

"I have committed no crime. I have missed no legal foreclosure payment, the respondents can not, did not, deny this truth, but the courts, can not find a legal remedy of justice for the respondents free will crime. * **Now used as blueprint for injustice.***

This evil deed of the respondents and supporters action off the record, is affecting, impacting the truth of fact, to protect the guilty respondent.

Let the record show clearly this case before the supreme court ,clearly impacts the florida Voulsia County case of chase bank VS. William Smith case NO.2006-10769 CODI. POINT OF LAW- Chase did not honorably try to settle this case out of court. Chase used the same scam on the Florida Court to try and remove the integrity of the Chase, Debt free, and Smith legal contract, to avoid paying legal damages, of which chase had knowledge, motive, intent to breach, destroy the contract. rights

NOTE- It was chase who wrote the contract, negotiated by Smith with Debt Free America and Debt Free America as the agent of Smith, for Smith, with Chase. NOTE- The Florida law requires all three names that is binding, by the contract to appear on the contract. POINT OF LAW- Chase talk the court into rejecting the contract as here say. When Chase and William Smith appeared before the Court in dispute over chase losing its copy and choosing to breach the contract of the Smiths and Debt Free copy which was legally authenticated and clearly met the Florida exception to hearsay rule 90.803 and hearsay rule 90.801 used to show that the contract exist

The Florida Court Ruled hearsay. But eventually reached the right legal conclusion. Showing Chase could not support its case with substantive evidence

NOTE-The court did not hear the Counter claim of the defendant Smith in any legal respect, but let Chase talk the court into using the ruling against chase not having a supportive case to meet the requirements of law.

But the court now being able to use the lack of this evidence against the legal defendants Counter Claim, ***Because if I did not know my rights as per law , I had no rights as per law. Losing them by court constitutional err.*** Without ever hearing the Counter Claim. All because the chase party Case is directly attached to "this" respondents case as a matter of law. And is used to drain away resources

that can be use to defend this evil crime Any damages would come from the Counter Claim

The Florida Impact case #2 to take my home on foreclosure fraud is GMAC mortgage VS. William Smith Case #2007-10025-CIDL Trial by jury is still pending to drain away all means, for the Smith family to protect them self from these three Fraudulent Constitutional cases. That clearly want to Side Step Constitutional Guaranteed law and the party braking the law fabricating false Charges go free.

NOTE- Now other creditors of William Smith, thru Debt Free, Contract. Who have been paid Timely, fairly in full, is using this same blue print for evading, and side stepping constitutional law, to make the Smith family pay twice, or defend fraud on all fronts, because the courts will not honor the constitutional principle of law to equal justice under the law. And Let Justice be Done Though the Heavens may fall. (SEE) Exhibit #2

"*MAXIM- ***Kill the means and you kill the case.!? The Counter Claim is still pending before the Florida Court lack of due process, and equal protection. Lack of substantive evidence to support the judgment .***"

Where under constitutional guaranteed justice, WHY should my family and I be made to loose everything for the courts, manifest err to protect

the guilty respondents crime. And this case can never, ever come to rest legally on constitutional guaranteed law, justice. Without the (pro se) petitioner its constitutional guaranteed rights to be proven guilty of a crime he did not commit.

The American people say "(This injustice price is too high).!?"

If no court reversed this manifest err. FACT-Court err ought not be done, but if done it is valid until undone by the supreme court Constitutional Guaranteed AUTHORITY FOR JUSTICE FOR all

The Petitioner With all due respect clearly request the court honor the necessary request for Supreme Court to grant Certiorari and finalize the respondent express waiver of admission of a guilty (plea) and used the court on incitive to put the extraordinary case to rest as a matter of plain constitutional due process and equal protection against this discrimination preserving the (pro se) defendants rights to be made whole by just to recover over $500,000.00 damages and counting and not let the respondent break the law, Side stepping justice and go free, The petitioner pray for constitutional justice protection as required by law, for this case to rest.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

(PRO SE) PETITIONER William Smith 1001 Saddle Hill Rd Deland Fl. 32720 ph#386-734-0476

AFFIDAVIT

I William Smith (pro se) petitioner, certified under the penalty of perjury, the forgoing petition for writ of certiorari request and the facts and evidence herein is true and correct.

EXECUTED--------DECEMBER 19,08----------

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

I William Smith (pro se) petitioner certify in good faith, three copies of this requested for writ of ceritorari petition, was sent - day of December, 18-08 to respondents Attorney of record- John R. Fischel of Miles and Stockbridge P.C. #10 Light Street Baltimore Maryland 21-202. PH# (410)-727-6464

In good faith RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

(Pro se) Petitioner

Supreme Court of the United States Office Of the Clerk Washington DC. 20543-0001

William K. Suter Clerk of the Court (202)-479-3011 December 1, 2008–

Mr. William Smith 1001 Saddle hill rd Deland Fl. 32720

RE: William Smith V. Alvin Friedman, ET AL. NO. 08-443

Dear Mr. Smith

The Court entered the following order in the above- entitled case:

The petition for writ of certiorari is denied

Sincerely (s)
William K. Suter, Clerk

Exhibit (1)

WAIVER

Supreme Court of the United States No. 08-443 William Smith (Petitioner) V. Alvin Friedman, et al (Respondent)– I DO NOT INTEND TO FILE A RESPONSE to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless one is request by the court.–Please Check one of the following boxes:- [x] please enter my appearance as counsel of record for all respondents.–[ ] There are multiple respondents, and I do not represent all respondents. Please enter my appearance as counsel for record for following respondents. (S):------ ------ I Certify that I am a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States (Please explain name change since bar admission.------- (S).--Date------ 10-22-08.-- (Type or print) Name --------[ ] Mr.* (NOTE No name is printed in this space) [ ] Ms ------ [ ] Mrs ---- [ ] Miss.------ Firm Miles & Stock bridge P.C.- Address 10 Light Street. City & State - Baltimore, Maryland Zip -21202 -- Phone -(410)-727-6464.- SEND A COPY OF THIS FORM TO PETITIONERS COUNSEL OR TO PETITIONER IF (PRO SE). PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE NAME (S) OF THE RECIPIENT (S) OF A COPY OF THIS FORM. NO ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE IS REQUIRED. Cc: William Smith.- Obtain status of case on the docket. By phone at 202-479-3034 or via the internet at http/ www.supreme courtus.gov. Have the Supreme Court Docket number available.

Exhibit (2)

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Presented in good faith and not for delay.
(Proceed) petitioner William Smith
1001 Saddle Hill, DeLand, FL 32720
Restricted to rule 44 rehearing under the grounds presented to respondense express waiver of admission defense plea 10-22-08, -08-443.



Respectfully submitted
(pro se) petitioner 12-19-08

Agent #1 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Respondent substitute trustee Supreme Court bar Kenneth J. Mac Fadyen, P.A. Totman Building Suite 400, 210 E. Redwood Street, Baltimore MD. 21202- PH#(410)-685-1763

Agent #2 Case CAE-97016794 (Extrinsic Fraud jurisdictional) Constitutional Direct appeal to Respondent Alvin Friedman, Substitute trustee—Express Waiver Admission Defencse 8-13-07 case #(07-11). Lack jurisdictional authority, respondents Attorney John R. Fischel Miles & Stockbridge, P.D. #10 Light Street Baltimore MD. 21202- PH# (410)-727-6464